

RAISES QUESTION OF WHAT THE POSITION OF CIA IN A FREE SOCIETY SHOULD BE

FOIA b3b

Barry Gray Show, at 10:00 PM, May 24, 1960 (NY and Buffalo, NY).

CPYRGHT

Barry Gray's guests were Dr. James Wechsler, author of "Reflections of an Angry Middle Aged Man" and author of "Reflections of an Angry Middle Aged Man" (NY, California State Democratic Committee), and Dr. Leonard S. Spector, author of the Broadway play, "A Majority of One." They were discussing the summit talks in Paris and the foreign policy of the United States with regard to the Soviet Union.

ZIFFREN: "We've got to start programming instead of talking."

GRAY: "Haven't we -- haven't we offered for five years now what has been called the 'open sky' inspection plan?"

ZIFFREN: "Sure, but the 'open sky' inspection plan is precisely what Russia will not accept because, to Russia, secrecy is part of her weapon. Russia considers secrecy an asset. I don't agree with this. I should like to see the world one open book to everyone. But it would be just like Russia telling us to give up bases for us to ask her to give up secrecy. And as long as this..."

GRAY: "But we would give up bases if we had 'open sky' inspection."

ZIFFREN: "Well, as a matter of fact, I think that now we're talking about the ingredients of a possible proposal. I'm not trying -- I'm not so presumptuous as to pretend that I can put together a package, but I think that the time has come for our diplomats in the State Department and the CIA, and whoever it is that's making policy, to decide what the package should be."

"And by the way, I'd like to raise the question as to just what the position of the CIA in a free society should be. I know it serves -- that we have to protect ourselves and we know the existence of espionage and counter-espionage. But I'd like to -- I think the American people have a right to debate the question."

WECHSLER: "Well, I would say, Paul, that I think there is a complexity in this that you haven't recognized, and that is that my own feeling is that there is a division within the Soviet Hierarchy, that there is a group which really feel that they ought to play this game for all it's worth, that the West can't lick them in political and economic competition, that agreements are devices, not agreements. To me the terrible blunder of the last ten days or two weeks is that I think we've strengthened all the most irrational and extremist forces within the Soviet Union, and that, as someone has suggested, we may look back nostalgically towards Khrushchev when we get his successor."

"So that I don't think we ought to kid ourselves that this is entirely just a matter of, you know, two debating societies, where a package can be wrapped up. I think the important and subtle difficulty in this is that Washington utterly failed to comprehend what the -- what the conflict of forces within the Soviet Union was, and made a misjudgment as fabulous as any in history. I say this only because I think, with all my criticism of what we've done, that there may come a time when we will discover that there is no level of rational discourse. That to me is the real danger point at which..."

ZIFFREN: "That's the point of no return."

WECHSLER: "What is the point which it seems to me all our efforts should be

CPYRGHT